

Hab. India, Belgaum (*H. E. Andrewes, Esq.*).

This species is closely allied to the preceding, but is black and differently sculptured and with more convex interstices to the elytra. The head has a small projecting lobe in the middle of the front margin, with a slight sinuosity in the margin on each side of its base. The thorax is rather strongly punctured, the punctures separated from each other by about half the diameter of a puncture. The elytra have the striæ more impressed than in the foregoing species, the punctures encroaching considerably on the interstices; the interstices very convex, almost impunctate.

The male has on the middle of the head a very short transverse ridge, about twice as broad as high, the angles of which are slightly swollen; behind this there is a very slight scarcely raised tubercle.

The female (or undeveloped male?) has the middle of the head slightly convex, and posteriorly there is a very slight tubercle.

[To be continued.]

LXI.—*Reply to the Rev. Canon Norman's Views respecting the proposed rejection of Cyclostoma, with Remarks on No. 10 Rule of the "Stricklandian Code."* By R. BULLEN NEWTON, F.G.S., British Museum (Natural History).

THE abandonment of a familiar name like *Cyclostoma*, proposed by me in last April's number of the 'Annals,' is a matter for considerable regret, though I fear many others equally well known must soon share the same fate and be relegated to the regions of synonymy if we would attain to a proper degree of accuracy in our conchological nomenclature.

Certain objections have been raised in the May number of the 'Annals' to my proposals on this subject by the Rev. Canon Norman which, on being analyzed, betray an amount of prejudice that, emanating from so distinguished an observer, is indeed to be deplored. He charges me with having "misapprehended the facts, and that no need exists for changing the names *Cyclostoma* and *Pomatias* as now in use." To defend my position it will be necessary to recapitulate some of the details connected with the genera and types involved, and for this purpose I shall place them in chronological order, as follows:—

- (1) POMATIAS, B. Studer, 1789 (= *Nerita elegans*, Müller).
- (2) SCALA (Klein, 1753), G. Humphrey, 1797 (= *Turbo scalaris*, Linn.).
- (3) CYCLOSTOMA, Lamarck, 1799 (= *Turbo scalaris*, Linn.).
- (4) CYCLOSTOMA, Draparnaud, 1801 (= *Nerita elegans*, Müller).
- (5) CYCLOSTOMA, Lamarck, 1801 (= *Turbo delphinus*, Linn.).
- (6) SCALARIA, Lamarck, 1801 (= *Turbo scalaris*, Linn.).
- (7) DELPHINULA, Lamarck, 1804 (= *Turbo delphinus*, Linn.).
- (8) POMATIAS, Hartmann, 1821 (= *Cyclostoma patulum*, Drap.).

Every naturalist on viewing this list of eight genera and their types would readily admit the very urgent importance for their final revision. Beginning with Studer's *Pomatias* of 1789, we find that its type was transferred by Draparnaud to his *Cyclostoma* of 1801. There is, then, no alternative, in the exercise of the just law of priority, but to accept this Studerian name to the exclusion of the other. The next genus, *Scala*, truly a Kleinian name, and consequently pre-Linnean, but which was used by G. Humphrey in 1797, just two years before the establishment of Lamarck's first *Cyclostoma*, is recommended for adoption not only on the ground of priority, but as being a means of escaping from the difficulties connected with the genera *Scalaria* and *Cyclostoma*, the types of which are identical with that of *Scala*.

Prof. W. H. Dall, of Washington, has just favoured me with a reference to his valuable report on the 'Blake' Mollusca*, in which, after a full discussion on every aspect of this question, he had no hesitation in deciding in favour of the retention of *Scala*. It is to be hoped that before long we shall hear that M. de Boury, the chief authority on the Scalidæ, will see the necessity for adopting the same, more especially as he employs the family name of Scalidæ for his group, and not Scalariidæ.

Lamarck cancelled one of the mistakes of his previous work when, in 1804, he established his genus *Delphinula*

* "Report on the Mollusca dredged by the U. S. Coast-Survey Steamer 'Blake,'" Gasteropoda and Scaphopoda, Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. Harvard Coll. 1889, vol. xviii. p. 299.

and attached as its type the *Turbo delphinus* of Linnæus, which had hitherto been identified with his *Cyclostoma* of 1801. In 1821 Hartmann introduced *Pomatias* in a totally different sense to that founded by Studer in 1789; hence it is apparent that a change in this name being necessary, and there being no available synonym to receive it, *Hartmannia*, recently proposed by me, must now be recognized.

Attention has lately been drawn to the fact in a contemporary journal * that this generic name had been utilized in botany, which, however, does not militate against its use in a zoological sense, as, according to the corrections made in 1865 in the British Association Rules, the subjects must be kept entirely distinct. Thus by the operation of the law of priority I have been enabled to reduce these eight genera to the number of four, which will henceforth stand as follows:—*Pomatias*, *Scala*, *Delphinula*, and *Hartmannia*. I am quite aware of the subsequent work done by Lamarck on his genera *Scalaria*, *Delphinula*, and *Cyclostoma*, as well as that of Deshayes on *Delphinula*, quotations from which are given in the Rev. Canon Norman's criticism; but we can only treat these genera from the dates on which they were separately founded, as no attempts were made in Lamarck's later researches to furnish a practical revision of the types of his earlier genera, except in the case of *Delphinula*, which he made perfectly definite for all time. Nothing could be clearer than the history of *Pomatias*, 1789; its distinct diagnosis and association with so well known a type leaves no loophole for hesitation as to what it included. The second species referred to under this genus was *P. variegatus*, a mere list or manuscript name without description of any kind. Not until 1820 † do we hear of it again, when we find that Studer himself included it as a synonym of *Cyclostoma maculatum*, Drap., which species he and subsequent authors have shown to be the same as *Helix septemspiralis* ‡ of Razoumowsky, 1789 §. This species, then, belongs to *Pomatias* as diagnosed by Hartmann, but which, differing from Studer's of 1789, now becomes *Hartmannia*.

Canon Norman makes some critical observations on the tenth Nomenclature Rule of the British Association which deserve close attention. The rule stands thus:—"A name

* 'British Naturalist,' May 1891, p. 100.

† 'Verzeichniss,' 1820, p. 22.

‡ Quoted wrongly by Canon Norman in his footnote, p. 448, as *Pomatias septemspiralis*.

§ Hist. Nat. Jorat, 1789, vol. i. p. 278.

should be changed which has before been proposed for some other genus in zoology or botany, or for some other species in the same genus, when still retained for such genus or species." He advocates the application of the latter part of this rule to the genera under consideration. He argues that if the first *Cyclostoma* is inadmissible, we must accept the second, though I have distinctly proved it to be the equivalent of Studer's genus of 1789. I beg therefore to differ materially from the Rev. Canon when he intimates that I have misapplied a rule of nomenclature in rejecting *Cyclostoma*, as I hold that I have not violated it in any one particular.

He appears to be only anxious to demonstrate that we should follow the opinion most generally received by conchologists on this subject, instead of thinking it a matter for congratulation that the discovery of the Studerian genus now relieves us from the difficulties that have surrounded *Cyclostoma* for upwards of ninety years.

In considering the latter part of this tenth rule, however, I can imagine grave difficulties arising in its application, and I beg to enter a very strong protest against it.

There will always be a variety of opinions as to whether an earlier name is obsolete or not. Rather than have this hesitation in the matter let us erase this clause from our statute-book and adopt the law of priority, without the particular limit specified, as a "fundamental" maxim. If reference is made to the American * view on this subject we find no such restriction in force. *Canon xxxiii.* reads:—"A generic name is to be changed which has been previously used for some other genus in the same kingdom." Again, *Canon xiv.* contains, "The adoption of a 'Statute of Limitation' in modification of the *lex prioritatis* is impracticable and inadmissible." Turning to continental views, we find it stated in Dr. R. Blanchard's † report, *article xii.*, "Tout nom générique déjà employé dans le même Règne devra être rejeté." A number of other instances could be quoted where we fail to discover the irksome limit implied in our English rule in the exercise of this law of priority. Suppose for a moment we consider Rule 10 in its application to the example given us by Canon Norman, viz. the genus *Normania*. Thrice has this name been applied. The first is rendered a synonym, because

* 'The Code of Nomenclature and Check-List of North-American Birds, being the Report of the Committee of the Union of Classification and Nomenclature.' 8vo, New York, 1886.

† 'De la Nomenclature des Êtres Organisés. Rapport présenté au Congrès International de Zoologie.' 8vo, Paris, 1889.

Loxoconcha was previously used for the same organism. Bowerbank, a little later, applying Rule 10, introduces it again for another group. The third occasion cited of its use is not of course difficult to cope with, as it takes its place without any comment in synonymy. Now I ask, if the second *Normania* were allowed to stand, what would be the effect if some day the name of *Loxoconcha* should prove to be pre-occupied? For it must be remembered that our ordinary channels of information for ascertaining such a point are not yet complete. We have by no means exhausted the literature. Numerous works are gradually coming to light which have hitherto escaped such skilful compilers as Agassiz, Marshall, and Scudder. No doubt to guard against such a contingency as I have hinted at Professor Sollas wisely altered the second *Normania* to *Pœcillastra*. However grievous such an alteration as this must be to the great naturalist referred to in the name, and while we must admit that Canon Norman's deduction from the latter part of Rule 10 seems to have been neglected by Prof. Sollas in making this change, yet it was brought about in accordance with the views held almost universally in other countries, and should consequently be admitted. I therefore maintain that to prevent confusion in the future Prof. Sollas's genus should stand, and that *Normania* should be allowed to repose quietly in synonymy until the time comes when it may be called forth to take the place of *Loxoconcha*.

I venture to ask Canon Norman if, in the compilation of his "Revision of British Mollusca," published in the 'Annals' for 1890, where he places under review some seventy or eighty genera and subgenera, he is aware that about a dozen of them are preoccupied names, and whether they remain so in his desire to carry out strictly to the letter his interpretation of the latter portion of Rule 10?

There is a great work to be done in our conchological nomenclature; and although much has been effected by continental authors, there still remains a considerable field for action. But if we are to be limited in our adoption of the law of priority we shall have endless confusion and unsatisfactory results. I consider that the importance of this matter deserves attention from the British Association at their next meeting, to settle whether zoological science would not be considerably advanced by the rescinding of the latter part of Rule 10 of the Stricklandian Code, the words of which are "when still retained for such genus or species."

I am indebted to my colleagues Messrs. E. A. Smith and G. A. Boulenger for some useful suggestions in the prepara-

tion of this paper—the former for advice on the conchological aspect of the question, and the latter for having supplied me with references to the literature on the subject of the nomenclature laws.

LXII.—*Descriptions of Three new Bats in the British Museum Collection.* By OLDFIELD THOMAS.

Hipposiderus Pratti, sp. n.

Allied and but little inferior in size to *H. armiger*. Frontal sac present (in the female, therefore certainly large in the as yet unknown male); the fleshy prominences on each side of the sac still more developed than in that species, and forming a sort of supplementary nose-leaf more than 3 millim. high, running right across the muzzle, and only interrupted in the centre where the opening of the frontal gland is placed. (In the male there is no doubt a still further development of this remarkable structure.) Terminal erect part of the true nose-leaf high in the centre and sloping down rapidly on the sides, its upper edge therefore far more convex than in the other species of the genus; its outer edges not continuous with the horseshoe; its front surface with a single central vertical ridge. Front edge of horseshoe sharply and distinctly notched in the centre. Two supplementary leaflets present on each side of the muzzle.

Ears as in *H. armiger*. Wing-membrane attached to the ankles. Last caudal vertebra free of the interfemoral membrane.

Colour of the fur (in alcohol) apparently dull smoky grey above and below.

Dimensions of the type, an adult female in alcohol:—

Head and body 90 millim.; tail 56; head 33; ear, above crown, 24; forearm 83 (=3.25 inches); lower leg 35; hind foot, including claws, 21.

Hab. Kia-ting-fu*, Western Sze-chuen, China. Collected by A. E. Pratt, Esq.

* Found in the artificial caves made by the ancient inhabitants of the district. In the very same cave as this specimen Mr. Pratt obtained a male of what appears to be *H. armiger*, unless the male of *H. Pratti* is like *H. armiger* while the female is quite different. This, while possible, is very unlikely. Fortunately both sexes are known not only of the true *H. armiger* but also of the Chinese *H. Swinhoei*, Peters, ordinarily considered to be synonymous with it, and therefore there can be no question as to the specific distinctness of the new form.